



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,309	06/13/2000	Manu Kumar	119645-00103.3	7378

7590
Alfred W. Zaher, Esq.
BLANK ROME LLP
One Logan Square
130 North 18th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

06/23/2008

EXAMINER

BOUTAH, ALINA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/592,309	Applicant(s) KUMAR, MANU	
	Examiner ALINA N. BOUTAH	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/592,309

Applicant(s)

KUMAR, MANU

Examiner

ALINA N. BOUTAH

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☐ This communication is responsive to ____.
2. ☐ The allowed claim(s) is/are ____.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * Certified copies not received: ____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date ____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date ____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).**
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date ____. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date ____ | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment received March 14, 2008.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application.

Specification

The use of the trademark such as Microsoft PowerPoint, Netscape, etc, has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 18-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
USPN 6,144,991 issued to England.

Regarding claim 18, England teaches an apparatus for interactive communications over a network among participants of a single conference at a plurality of locations, the apparatus comprising:

a plurality of computers operatively connected to a network, wherein each of the plurality of computers includes a computer readable medium storage device comprising:

computer instructions providing user designation of any one of the plurality of computers as lead computer (figure 5: guide computer 506);

computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network (abstract – client computer); and

computer instructions for transmitting to other of the plurality of computers, as lead computer, information received and displayed from the network, wherein the other of the plurality of computers each generally simultaneously display the identical transmitted information, as the lead computer, and wherein the computer instructions for transmitting comprises a shared web browser allowing the other of the plurality of computers to follow the leader through the Internet (abstract).

Regarding claim 19, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, wherein the network comprises the Internet (figure 1 – internet 101).

Regarding claim 20, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, wherein the computer instructions for transmitting comprises a presenter interface (guide) that includes computer instructions for communicating with each of the other of the plurality of computers and

Art Unit: 2154

for causing information to be generally simultaneously displayed on the other of the plurality of computers (abstract – guide presenting information to client and simultaneously display information).

Regarding claim 21, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for receiving additional information entered in a shared web browser white board from at least one of the other of the plurality of computers over the network, wherein the other of the plurality of computers and the leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information in the shared web browser white board, and wherein the additional information is entered by a user of a computer from the other of the plurality of computers (figure 10 – chat program).

Regarding claim 22, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 21, further comprising computer instructions for receiving text-based conferencing information from at least one of the other of the plurality of computers over the network, wherein the other of the plurality of computers and the leader computer each generally simultaneously display the text-based conferencing information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser window and the shared web browser white board (figure 10 – chat program separate from whiteboard).

Regarding claim 23, teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 22, further comprising computer instructions for assigning different color to the text-based conferencing information

Art Unit: 2154

received, the color identifying origination of the text-based conferencing information (col. 5, lines 27-36).

Regarding claim 25, the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for initiating designation of one of the other of the plurality of computers as a replacement leader computer, wherein a presentation of information on, or a selection of a web site in, the replacement leader computer causes the information presented, or the web site selected, to be generally simultaneously displayed on each of the other of the plurality of computers (col. 5, lines 26-36 – “share pointer” in which any user can select any feature and all other users will see the same, therefore it is broadly interpreted as leader’s designation).

Regarding claim 26, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for transmitting comments or questions from any one or more of the other of the plurality of computers to the leader computer (figure 10 – chat program for client to send questions or comments to guide).

Regarding claim 27, the apparatus as recited in claim 18, further comprising computer instructions for terminating, from the leader computer, a connection of any one or more of the other of the plurality of computers from the network (figure 30 – terminating a session).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,144,991 issued to England in view of USPN 6,108,687 issued to Craig.

Regarding claim 1, England teaches an apparatus for interactive communications over a network among participants of a single conference at a plurality of locations, the apparatus comprising:

a leader computer operatively connected to the network (figure 5: guide computer 506) ;
a computer readable storage device accessible by the leader computer, the storage device including computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network (figure 5: piper server 502); and

computer instructions for transmitting the information to a plurality of other computers over the network, wherein said other computers each generally simultaneously displays the transmitted information (abstract – “The remotely displayable frames are transmitted to the client so that both the guide and the client have identical views of the remotely displayable frames.”);
said

computer instructions for transmitting comprising a shared web browser to allow the leader to surf through the internet and to cause said other computers to follow the leader through the internet (col. 10, lines 37-52 – client receiving internet resources under control of the guide, the guide coordinating collaborative tools such as chat program, whiteboard, etc), wherein various combinations of shared web browsers can be used for the leader and the other computers (i.e. Netscape vs. Internet Explorer); and

computer instructions for receiving additional information entered in a shared web browser white board from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information in the shared web browser whiteboard, and wherein the additional information is entered by a user of a computer from the plurality of other computers to be associated with the already displayed information (figure 10 which includes whiteboard and chat program as an alternative to telephone conference); and

computer instructions for receiving text-based conferencing information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the text-base conferencing information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser and the shared web browser white board (figure 10 – whiteboard on top frame and chat window on the bottom right frame, the chat window displays text-based conferencing information and does not alter what is in the whiteboard).

However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches

the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 2, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the network comprises the Internet (figure 1 – internet 101).

Regarding claim 3, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein said computer instructions for receiving and displaying information from the network comprises a web browser (i.e. figure 3).

Regarding claim 8, England teaches a method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants of a single conference situated at two or more locations, wherein each of said participants has a computer operatively connected to a computer network, the method comprising:

- a) providing a website on the computer network for said participants to obtain access to the collaborative presentation (i.e. figure 3);

- b) providing information to be displayed on each of said participants' computers during the collaborative presentation (i.e. figure 10);

- c) providing means for said participants to access the website (i.e. figure 6); and

d) initiating the collaborative presentation by one of said plurality of participants presenting the information on the one of said participants' computers, wherein the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants generally simultaneously displays the information (figure 8).

e) interactively adding information associated with the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants in a shared web browser white board, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the additional information in the shared web browser white board (col. 5, lines 37-54); and

f) initiating a text-based conferencing by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the text-based conferencing information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser and the shared web browser white board (figure 10 – chat program).

However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 9, England teaches a method of conducting a conference among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations over a computer network, the method comprising:

- a) providing a website on the computer network (i.e. figure 3);
- b) providing means for said participants to access the website via a computer having a display (i.e. figure 6);
- c) providing a browser interface for conducting the conference (i.e. figure 10), wherein various combinations of shared web browsers can be used for the leader and the other computers (i.e. Netscape vs. Internet Explorer);
- d) operably connecting each said participants' computers such that the display of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the shared browser interface (abstract – guide computer and client computers simultaneously displaying same information); and
- e) providing a white board to allow each participants to enter additional information associated with the display of the shared browser interface having identical information in a main window (abstract), the additional information being displayed in the white board, thereby not altering the display of the shared browser interface (figure 10 – chat program).

However, England does not explicitly teach wherein the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously. In analogous art, Craig teaches the leader and the other computers are participating in no more than one conference simultaneously (abstract – instructor computer and student computers participating in one conference). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to enable the leader and other computers to participate in no more than one conference because it is easier to manage, thus ensure the likelihood that communications are synchronized.

Regarding claim 10, England teaches as recited in claim 9 further including the step of categorizing said participants into one of a presenter participant or an attendee participant, such that the presenter participants' computer controls each of said attendee participants' computers via the browser interface (abstract – guide computer controlling client computers).

Regarding claim 11, this is similar to claim 9 because all the elements listed are essentially the same as claim 9 but in apparatus form rather than method form. Furthermore, claim 11 further recites computer instructions providing text based communication interface in a separate shared browser window, thereby not altering the display in the shared browser interface or in the whiteboard, to allow each participant to initiate and participate in text-based conferencing during the conference (figure 10 – chat program in addition to the whiteboard, the chat window is separate from the whiteboard, thus not altering the content of the whiteboard).

Regarding claim 12, England teaches the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, further including the step of initiating display of a list of all of the plurality of participants (figure 34 – “list clients”).

Regarding claim 14, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising computer instructions for transmitting comments or questions from any one or more

Art Unit: 2154

of the plurality of other computers to the leader computer (figure 10 – user can submit questions to guide in the chat window).

Regarding claim 15, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising computer instructions for assigning different color to the text-based conferencing information received in the leader computer of each of the plurality of other computers to identify origination of the text-based conferencing information (col. 5, lines 27-36).

Regarding claim 17, England teaches the apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprising computer instructions for terminating, from the leader computer, a connection of any one or more of the plurality of other computers from the network (figure 30 – terminating a session).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Craig, in further view of *Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000* by Rutledge et al.

Regarding claim 5, England teaches a method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants situated at two or more locations, wherein each of said participants has a computer operatively connected to a computer network, the method comprising:

a) providing a web site on the computer network for a said participants to obtain access to the collaborative presentation (figure 6);

c) providing information to be displayed on each of said participant's computers during the collaborative presentation (abstract); and

e) initiating the collaborative presentation by one of said plurality of participants presenting the information on the leader's computers, wherein the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants generally simultaneously displays the information on the leader's computer (figure 9);

f) interactively adding information associated with the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants in a shared web browser white board, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the additional information in the shared white board (figure 10);

g) sharing a web browser of one of said plurality of participants with each of the other of said plurality of participants, so that the shared web browser causes the plurality of participants to collectively surf through the internet according to web sites selected by the leader on the leader's computer (abstract); and

h) initiating the leader's designation of one of the other of said plurality of participants as a new leader, wherein a presentation of information, or a selection of a web site, on the new leader's computer causes the information presented, or web site selected, on the new leader's computer to be generally simultaneously displayed on the computer of each of the other of said plurality of participants (col. 5, lines 26-36 – "share pointer" in which any user can select any feature and all other users will see the same, therefore it is broadly interpreted as leader's designation).

However, England does not explicitly teach:

b) sending a message to each of said plurality of participants, the message providing an identifier means for accessing the collaborative presentation; and

d) accessing the website to the identifier means.

In an analogous art, Rutledge teaches b) and d) (Chapter 17, Using Online Broadcasts and Meetings pages 1-11). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable said identifier means to comprise a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation in order to ensure that participants will access the presentation at the specific time and date, therefore, ensuring that those that are intended to participate in the presentation will not be left out.

Regarding claim 6, England teaches the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, further including the step of initiating a telephone conference call while conducting the collaborative presentation (col. 6, lines 53-54 - telephone to call for personal assistance).

Regarding claim 7, England does not explicitly teach the method of conducting a collaborative presentation among a plurality of participants as recited in claim 5, wherein said identifier means comprises one or more of a confirmation number, and a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation. Rutledge et al. teaches said identifier means comprises a scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation (Chapter 17, Using Online Broadcasts and Meetings pages 1-11). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable said identifier means to comprise a

Art Unit: 2154

scheduled date and time for accessing the collaborative presentation in order to ensure that participants will access the presentation at the specific time and date, therefore, ensuring that those that are intended to participate in the presentation will not be left out.

Claims 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Craig, in further view of Examiner's Official Notice.

Regarding claims 16 and 24, although England does not explicitly teach computer instructions for blocking the text-based conferencing information forwarded from any one or more of the plurality of other computers, he teaches a chat program that is included in the conferencing information (i.e. figure 10). The Examiner takes official notice that in a chat program, a feature of blocking a text-based conferencing information is well known in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 4 and 13, as amended by Applicant, the prior art or record does not teach the claimed invention

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding claims 18-23 and 25-27, Applicant has amended the independent claim to further recite that the screen display is identical in a single conference. However, the feature of "single conference" is only recited in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2154

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALINA N. BOUTAH whose telephone number is (571)272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. N. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2143

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154